arXiv:1702.05645v1 [math.OC] 18 Feb 2017

Tractability of Convex Vector Optimization Problems in the Sense of Polyhedral Approximations

Firdevs Ulus

February 21, 2017

Abstract

There are different solution concepts for convex vector optimization problems (CVOPs) and a recent one, which is motivated from a set optimization point of view, consists of finitely many efficient solutions that generate polyhedral inner and outer approximations to the Pareto frontier. A CVOP with compact feasible region is known to be bounded and there exists a solution of this sense to it, [15]. However, it is not known if it is possible to generate polyhedral inner and outer approximations to the Pareto frontier of a CVOP if the feasible region is not compact. This study shows that not all CVOPs are tractable in that sense and gives a characterization of tractable problems in terms of the well known weighted sum scalarization problems. We also show that the proper efficient solutions in the sense of linear scalarizations coincide with the efficient solutions for tractable CVOPs.

Keywords: Vector optimization, multiobjective optimization, convex programming, polyhedral approximation.

MSC 2010 Classification: 90C29, 90C25

1 Introduction

Vector optimization problem is to minimize an $\mathbb{R}^q$-valued objective function with respect to the partial order induced by an ordering cone $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ over a feasible region. Whenever the ordering cone is the positive orthant, the problem turns out to be a multi-objective optimization problem, namely q objective functions are to be minimized with respect to the component-wise ordering.

There are different solution concepts regarding vector optimization problems. A *minimizer* (efficient solution or Pareto optimal solution) for instance is a singleton in the feasible set that can not be dominated by the other feasible points. Similarly, a *weak minimizer* (weakly efficient solution or weak Pareto optimal solution) is a feasible solution that can not be strictly dominated. Scalarization techniques are widely used to find a weak minimizer, see for instance [13]. There are also some direct methods, see for instance the subgradient method provided in [3].

More recently, a different solution concept, which is motivated from a set optimization point of view, has been introduced for linear vector optimization problems by Löhne in [14], and then extended to convex vector optimization problems in [15]. Accordingly, a solution consists of finitely many weak minimizers which, together with the extreme directions of the ordering cone, generate an inner and an outer approximation to the Pareto frontier.

There are studies in the literature that focus on specific subclasses of vector optimization problems and propose algorithms/methods to find specific types of solutions. In particular, linear vector optimization problems (LVOPs) are well-understood and several algorithms have been proposed either to find the set of all minimizers or to find a sufficiently large subset of minimizers which generates the Pareto frontier. Some of these algorithms are extensions of the well-known simplex algorithm [5, 7, 18], whereas some of them are different variants [9, 14] or geometric dual versions [4, 11] of Benson's algorithm [1].

Benson's algorithm is an outer approximation algorithm that works in the objective space. Recently, it has been also extended to 'solve' convex vector optimization problems (CVOPs), see [6, 15]. Algorithm proposed in [6] can solve convex multiobjective problems where the objective and the constraint functions are differentiable. In [15], this algorithm is extended for vector optimization problems where the differentiability of the objective and constraint functions are not required as long as corresponding scalar convex programs can be solved. Moreover, a geometric dual algorithm for solving CVOPs is proposed in [15]. These algorithms find *solutions* to CVOPs in the sense that they find finitely many minimizers which generate an inner and an outer approximation to the Pareto frontier. All three algorithms assume that the feasible region is compact and hence the problem is *bounded*, that is, the image of the feasible region in the objective space is included in a shifted cone, namely $a + K$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and K being the ordering cone of the problem. In some applications, the feasible region of a convex vector optimization problem is not compact. Computation of some set valued risk measures [15] can be given as an example of such cases. In general, the problem of interest may be unbounded or it may be difficult to check if it is a bounded problem.

The aim of this study is to understand the structure of possibly unbounded CVOPs and to see if these problems are *tractable* in the sense that there exists polyhedral outer an inner approximations to the Pareto frontier. We provide a simple example for which the problem is not bounded and it is not possible to find polyhedral outer and inner approximations such that the Hausdorff distance between the two is finite. On the other hand, the existence of unbounded but *tractable* problems is known. For instance, it is possible to generate the Pareto frontier of an unbounded linear vector optimization problem as long as image of the feasible region is not the whole space.

Here, we provide a characterization of *tractable* CVOPs depending on the recession cone of the *upper image* (image of the feasible region added to the original ordering cone) of the problem. Accordingly, there exists a polyhedral inner and outer approximations to the Pareto frontier of a CVOP if and only if the problem is bounded with respect to the ordering cone taken as the recession cone of the upper image of the problem. We call such problems *self-bounded*.

We give a characterization of the recession cone of the upper image of a self-bounded problem in terms of the well-known weighted sum scalarization problems. Accordingly, for a self-bounded problem, the set of weights which makes the weighted sum scalarization problem bounded is equal to the (positive) dual cone of the recession cone. Moreover, we also show the reverse implication, that is, if these two sets are equal, then the problem is self-bounded.

Note that for a convex vector optimization problem, an optimal solution of a weighted sum scalarization problem is known to be a weak minimizer. The reverse implication is known for linear vector optimization problems but to the best of our knowledge, a general result for a CVOP is not available. Here, we show that if the feasible region is closed and the problem is self-bounded, then for each weak minimizer, there exists a weight vector from the dual cone of the recession cone such that the weak minimizer is an optimal solution to the corresponding

weighted sum scalarization problem. In particular, for bounded problems with closed feasible regions, each weak minimizer is an optimal solution to the weighted sum scalarization problem for some weight vector coming from the dual cone of the ordering cone.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 is dedicated to basic concepts and notation. In Section 3, some results on convex upper closed sets are provided. The convex vector optimization problem, its solution concepts and the main results of the paper are provided in Section 4. We conclude and discuss on possible future research direction initiated by the results of this paper in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

For a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$, the interior, closure, boundary, convex hull and the conic hull of A are denoted respectively by $\operatorname{int} A$, $\operatorname{cl} A$, $\operatorname{bd} A$, $\operatorname{conv} A$, and $\operatorname{cone} A$. Moreover, $k \in \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\}$ is called a direction of A if $A + \{\alpha k \in \mathbb{R}^q : \alpha > 0\} \subseteq A$. The *recession cone* $\operatorname{recc} A$ of A consists of the directions of A, that is,

$$\operatorname{recc} A = \{k \in \mathbb{R}^q |\ \forall a \in A, \forall \alpha \geq 0 :\ a + \alpha k \in A\}. \tag{1}$$

A polyhedral convex set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ can be written as

$$A = \operatorname{conv}\{x^1, \ldots, x^s\} + \operatorname{cone}\{k^1, \ldots, k^t\}, \tag{2}$$

where $s \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}, t \in \mathbb{N}$, each $x^i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is a point, and each $k^j \in \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\}$ is a direction of A. The set of points $\{x^1, \ldots, x^s\}$ together with the set of directions $\{k^1, \ldots, k^t\}$ are said *to generate* the polyhedral convex set A. Throughout we also consider (not necessarily polyhedral) convex subsets of $\mathbb{R}^q$ in the form $A = \operatorname{conv}\{x^1, \ldots, x^s\} + K$ where $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ is a convex cone. In this case, the set of points $\{x^1, \ldots, x^s\}$ together with cone K are said *to generate* A.

The *distance* from a point $y \in \mathbb{R}^q$ to a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ is given by $d(y, A) := \inf_{a \in A} \|y - a\|$. The *Hausdorff distance* between two closed sets A_1 and A_2 is given by

$$h(A_1, A_2) = \max\{\sup_{a_1 \in A_1} d(a_1, A_2), \sup_{a_2 \in A_2} d(a_2, A_1)\}. \tag{3}$$

A convex cone C is said to be *solid*, if it has a non-empty interior; *pointed* if it does not contain any line; and *non-trivial* if $\{0\} \subsetneq C \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^q$. A non-trivial convex pointed cone C defines a partial ordering $\leq_C$ on $\mathbb{R}^q$: $v \leq_C w$ if and only if $w - v \in C$. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ be a non-trivial convex pointed cone and $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ a convex set. A function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}^q$ is said to be *C-convex* if $f(\alpha x + (1-\alpha)y) \leq_C \alpha f(x) + (1-\alpha) f(y)$ holds for all $x, y \in X$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, see e.g. [16, Definition 6.1].

A point $y \in A$ is called *C-minimal element* of A if $(\{y\} - C \setminus \{0\}) \cap A = \emptyset$. If the cone C is solid, then a point $y \in A$ is called *weakly C-minimal element* if $(\{y\} - \operatorname{int} C) \cap A = \emptyset$. The set of all (weakly) C-minimal elements of A is denoted by $(\mathrm{w})\mathrm{Min}_C(A)$. The (positive) dual cone of C is the set $C^+ := \left\{z \in \mathbb{R}^q |\ \forall y \in C : z^T y \geq 0\right\}$.

Let cone $C \subseteq R^q$ be nontrivial, pointed and solid. A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ is said to be *upper closed with respect to C* if $A = \operatorname{cl}(A + C)$, and *convex upper closed with respect to C* if $A = \operatorname{cl}\operatorname{conv}(A + C)$. The collection of such sets are denoted by $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$, that is,

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C) := \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q |\ A = \operatorname{cl}\operatorname{conv}(A + C)\}. \tag{4}$$

It is known that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ is a complete lattice under $\supseteq$, see [14]. $A \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ is said to be *bounded* if there exists some $y \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $y + C \supseteq A$. Similarly, for any cone $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$, we say that A is *bounded with respect to* K if there exists some $y \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $y + K \supseteq A$.

Throughout, $B(a, r)$ denotes the closed ball around $a \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with radius $r > 0$. Positive orthant in $\mathbb{R}^q$ is $\mathbb{R}^q_+ := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^q |\ y_i \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, q\}$.

3 On Convex Upper Closed Sets

For solving convex vector optimization problems, convex upper closed sets with respect to the ordering cone of the problem play an important role as the image of the set of all weak minimizers (weakly efficient solutions) can be seen as (a subset of) the boundary of a convex upper closed set known as the *upper image*. Indeed, there are solution concepts for convex vector optimization problems that involve generating (approximations to) the upper image, see for instance [14, 15]. For linear vector optimization problems it is possible to generate this set by a finite set of points and a finite set of directions [14], whereas for nonlinear convex vector optimization problems, a solution usually generates an inner and an outer approximation to the upper image [15].

If an upper closed set A is known to be bounded with respect to K, then it may be possible to find an outer approximation to A which is generated by a finite set $\bar{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ and cone K in the sense that $\operatorname{conv} \bar{Y} + K \supseteq A$. If one also wants to generate an inner approximation using the same cone K, then $A + K \subseteq K$ needs to be satisfied. The following proposition shows that such cone K needs to be equal to the recession cone $\operatorname{recc} A$ of A.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $A \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ be bounded with respect to K for some closed convex cone K which also satisfies $A + K \subseteq A$. Then, $K = \operatorname{recc} A$.*

Proof. As A is bounded with respect to K, there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}^q$ such that $y + K \supseteq A$. Then, $K \supseteq \operatorname{recc} A$. On the other hand, $A + K \subseteq A$ implies that $K \subseteq \operatorname{recc} A$. □

Definition 3.2. *A nonempty set $A \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ is said to be* self-bounded *if $A \neq \mathbb{R}^q$ and it is bounded with respect to its own recession cone* $\operatorname{recc} A$. *A is* self-unbounded *if it is not self-bounded.*

Remark 3.3. *For a nonempty set $A \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$,* $\operatorname{recc} A$ *is a nonempty closed convex cone and it is solid as* $\operatorname{recc} A \supseteq C$. *If A is self-bounded then* $\operatorname{recc} A \neq \mathbb{R}^q$ *by definition. Hence,* $\operatorname{recc} A$ *is either pointed or it is an halfspace. Moreover, since A is a convex set,* $\operatorname{recc} A$ *is an halfspace only if A itself is an halfspace.*

Remark 3.4. *Let the set of all self-bounded sets in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ be $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$. It can be shown easily that $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ is closed under finite intersections. Indeed, for $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$, there exists $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^q$ such that $B_i \in b_i + \operatorname{recc} B_i$, for $i = 1, 2$. Moreover,* $\operatorname{recc}(B_1 \cap B_2) = \operatorname{recc} B_1 \cap \operatorname{recc} B_2 \supseteq C$. *Let $b \in (b_1 - \operatorname{recc}(B_1 \cap B_2)) \cap (b_1 - \operatorname{recc}(B_1 \cap B_2))$. Note that the existence of such b is guaranteed as* $\operatorname{recc}(B_1 \cap B_2)$ *is solid. Then, it can be shown easily that $B_1 \cap B_2 \subseteq b + \operatorname{recc}(B_1 \cap B_2)$.*

The following lemma together with Propositions 3.6 and 3.8 show the importance of the concept of self-boundedness in terms of approximations of convex upper closed sets via convex sets of the form $\operatorname{conv}\{a^1, \ldots, a^s\} + K$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ be a compact and convex set, $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ be a non-trivial solid convex cone and $c \in \operatorname{int} K$ be fixed. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite set $\bar{A} \subseteq A$ such that $\operatorname{conv} \bar{A} + K - \epsilon\{c\} \supseteq A + K$.*

Proof. Let $B := B(0, 2\epsilon \|c\|) \cap K$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the L^2-norm. Define

$$A_\epsilon := \operatorname{conv} [(A - \epsilon\{c\}) \cup A] + B.$$

Note that $A \subseteq \operatorname{int} A_\epsilon$. Indeed, for any $a \in A$, $a - \epsilon c \in \operatorname{conv} [(A - \epsilon\{c\}) \cup A]$, and $\epsilon c \in \operatorname{int} B$ as $c \in \operatorname{int} K$. Furthermore, we have $A_\epsilon \subseteq A - \epsilon\{c\} + K$. To see, let $a \in A_\epsilon$. Note that $a = \alpha(a^1 - \epsilon c) + (1-\alpha)a^2 + b$, for some $a^1, a^2 \in A$, $b \in B$, and $\alpha \in [0,1]$. Now, $a = \alpha a^1 + (1-\alpha)a^2 - \epsilon c + (1-\alpha)\epsilon c + b \in A - \epsilon\{c\} + K$, since $\alpha a^1 + (1-\alpha)a^2 \in A$, and $(1-\alpha)\epsilon c + b \in K$.

Let $(S_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ be the collection of all finite subsets of A_ϵ. Define $\tilde{S}_\alpha := \operatorname{int} \operatorname{conv} S_\alpha$. $(\tilde{S}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ is an open cover for A, and there exists a finite subcover as A is compact, that is, there exists $\tilde{s} \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\tilde{s}} \tilde{S}_{\alpha_n} \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\tilde{s}} \operatorname{conv} S_{\alpha_n}$. Let $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\tilde{s}} S_{\alpha_n} = \{v^1, \ldots, v^s\}$. Clearly, $A \subseteq \operatorname{conv}\{v^1, \ldots, v^s\}$. As $v^n \in A_\epsilon \subseteq A - \epsilon\{c\} + K$, there exists $a^n \in A, k^n \in K$ such that $v^n = a^n - \epsilon c + k^n$ for all $n = 1, \ldots, s$. Then, $\operatorname{conv}\{v^1, \ldots, v^s\} + K \supseteq A + K$ implies that $\bar{A} = \{a^1, \ldots, a^s\}$ satisfies the assertion. □

Proposition 3.6. *Let $A \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ be bounded with respect to a non-trivial convex cone $K \supseteq C$ and $c \in \operatorname{int} C$ be fixed. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite set of points $\bar{A} \subseteq A$ such that*

$$\operatorname{conv} \bar{A} + K - \epsilon\{c\} \supseteq A. \tag{5}$$

Proof. First, we show that there exists a compact set $B \subseteq A$ such that $B + K - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\{c\} \supseteq A$. Consider the sequence of sets given by $B_n := a + nc - C$ for $n \geq 1$, where $a \in A$ is fixed. Note that $B_n \subseteq B_{n+1}$ holds for all $n \geq 1$, and $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} B_n = \mathbb{R}^q$. Hence, $\bigcup_{n \geq 1}(B_n \cap A) + K \supseteq A$. Note that since A is bounded with respect to K, there exists $p \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $p \leq_K \tilde{a}$ for all $\tilde{a} \in B_n \cap A$. Moreover, $\tilde{a} \leq_K a + (n+1)c$ for all $\tilde{a} \in B_n \cap A$. Since $K \supseteq C$ is solid, $B_n \cap A$ is compact for all $n \geq 1$. Let $\epsilon_n := \inf\{\delta > 0 \mid (B_n \cap A) + K - \delta\{c\} \supseteq A\}$. As A is bounded with respect to K, $\epsilon_n \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Moreover, $(\epsilon_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is decreasing and $\lim_{n \to \infty} \epsilon_n = 0$ since $(B_n \cap A) + K \subseteq (B_{n+1} \cap A) + K$, and $\cup_{n \geq 1}(B_n \cap A) + K \supseteq A$. Then, there exists $N > 0$ such that $\epsilon_n < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $n > N$ and $B = (B_{N+1} \cap A)$ satisfies the required property.
By Lemma 3.5, there exists a finite set $\bar{A} \in B$ such that $\operatorname{conv} \bar{A} + K - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\{c\} \supseteq B + K$. Then, we have $\operatorname{conv} \bar{A} + K - \epsilon\{c\} \supseteq B + K - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\{c\} \supseteq A$. □

Remark 3.7. *Note that if $A \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ is self-bounded, then $\operatorname{recc} A$ is a non-trivial convex cone and $\operatorname{recc} A \supseteq C$. By Proposition 3.6, it is possible to generate finite outer approximation to A using $\operatorname{recc} A$. Indeed, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a finite subset $\bar{A}$ of A such that $A^{out} := \operatorname{conv} \bar{A} + \operatorname{recc} A - \epsilon\{c\} \supseteq A$. Moreover, $\bar{A}$ also generates an inner approximation as $A^{in} := \operatorname{conv} \bar{A} + \operatorname{recc} A \subseteq A$. It is clear that the Hausdorf distance between the inner and the outer approximations are bounded, namely, $h(A^{out}, A^{in}) \leq \epsilon \|c\|$.*

The following proposition shows that if A is self-unbounded as in Definition 3.2, then it is not possible to find a polyhedral outer approximation $A^{\text{out}} \supseteq A$ such that the Hausdorff distance between A^{out} and A is finite.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $A \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ be self-unbounded but bounded with respect to K for some non-trivial closed convex cone K. Let a finite set $\bar{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ satisfies $\operatorname{conv} \bar{Y} + K \supseteq A$. Then, $h(\operatorname{conv} \bar{Y} + K, A) = \infty$.*

Proof. Since A is self-unbounded but bounded with respect to K, $K \supsetneq \operatorname{recc} A$. Moreover, there exists $\bar{y} \in \bar{Y} \setminus A$ and $\bar{k} \in K \setminus \operatorname{recc} A$ such that $\{\bar{y} + \lambda \bar{k} |\ \lambda \geq 0\} \cap \operatorname{int} A = \emptyset$ since $\operatorname{conv} \bar{Y} + K \supseteq A$ and A is self-unbounded. Let $\bar{a} \in A$ be such that $\|\bar{a} - \bar{y}\| = d(\bar{y}, A)$. As $\bar{k} \notin \operatorname{recc} A$, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\bar{a} + \alpha \bar{k} \notin A$. Then, there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\gamma^T \bar{a} + \alpha \gamma^T \bar{k} > \sup_{a \in A} \gamma^T a$. Clearly, $\gamma^T \bar{k} > 0$. Let $H = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^q |\ \gamma^T y = \gamma^T \bar{a} + \alpha \gamma^T \bar{k}\}$ and $\bar{H} = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^q |\ \gamma^T y \leq \gamma^T \bar{a} + \alpha \gamma^T \bar{k}\} \supseteq A$. Consider $y^n := \bar{y} + n\bar{k}$. On the one hand, as $\gamma^T k > 0$, there exists $N \geq 1$ such that $y^n \notin \bar{H}$ for $n \geq N$. Let $d_n := d(y^n, \bar{H})$. Then, for $n \geq N$, $d_n \leq d(y^n, A) \leq h(\operatorname{conv} \bar{Y} + K, A)$. On the other hand, y^n can be written as $y^n = y + d_n \frac{\gamma}{\|\gamma\|}$ for some $y \in H$ as $\frac{\gamma}{\|\gamma\|}$ is the unit normal vector to H. Then, for $n > N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_n &= \frac{1}{\|\gamma\|}(\gamma^T y^n - \gamma^T y) \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\gamma\|}(\gamma^T y^N + (n-N)\gamma^T \bar{k} - \gamma^T \bar{a} - \alpha \gamma^T \bar{k}) \\ &> \frac{1}{\|\gamma\|}(\gamma^T \bar{a} + \alpha \gamma^T \bar{k} + (n-N)\gamma^T \bar{k} - \gamma^T \bar{a} + \alpha \gamma^T \bar{k}) \\ &= \frac{(n-N)\gamma^T \bar{k}}{\|\gamma\|} \end{aligned}$$

Then, $h(\operatorname{conv} \bar{Y} + K, A) \geq \lim_{n \to \infty} d_n = \infty$. □

4 Convex Vector Optimization

4.1 Problem Setting and Solution Concepts

A convex vector optimization problem (CVOP) with ordering cone C is to

$$\text{minimize } f(x) \text{ with respect to } \leq_C \text{ subject to } g(x) \leq_D 0, \tag{P}$$

where $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$, and $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ are non-trivial pointed convex ordering cones with nonempty interior, $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex set, the vector-valued objective function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}^q$ is C-convex, and the constraint function $g : X \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is D-convex (see e.g. [16]). Note that the feasible set $\mathcal{X} := \{x \in X : g(x) \leq_D 0\} \subseteq X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ of (P) is convex. Throughout we assume that (P) is feasible, i.e., $\mathcal{X} \neq \emptyset$. The image of the feasible set is defined as $f(\mathcal{X}) = \{f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^q : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$. The set

$$\mathcal{P} := \operatorname{cl}(f(\mathcal{X}) + C) \tag{6}$$

is called the *upper image* of (P) (or *upper closed extended image of* (P), see [10]). Clearly, $\mathcal{P}$ is convex and closed. Hence $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$. Moreover, $\operatorname{bd} \mathcal{P} \cap f(\mathcal{X}) = \operatorname{wMin}_C f(\mathcal{X})$, see for instance Proposition 4.1 in [6].

Remark 4.1. *Proposition 4.1 in [6] also states that $\mathcal{P}$ is bounded with respect to $\mathbb{R}^q_+$ but this is true only under the assumption that the feasible region $\mathcal{X}$ is bounded, see Example 4.6 for a simple counterexample.*

Definition 4.2. *Let K be a closed convex cone such that $K \supseteq C$. Problem* (P) *is said to be* bounded with respect to K *if $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^q, C)$ is bounded with respect to K.* (P) *is said to be* bounded *if it is bounded with respect to C and* unbounded *if it is not bounded.*

There are different solution concepts regarding CVOPs. The following is a well-known solution concept which is also known as a (weakly) efficient solution or (weakly) Pareto optimal solution of (P).

Definition 4.3. *An element $\bar{x}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ is said to be a* (weak) minimizer *if $f(\bar{x}) \in (\mathrm{w})\mathrm{Min}_C$.*

Note that the image of a (weak) minimizer is a single point on the boundary of the upper image. For bounded convex vector optimization problems, an ϵ-solution concept which generates inner and outer approximations to the whole upper image is given in [15] as follows.

Definition 4.4. *[15, Definition 3.3] For a bounded problem* (P)*, a nonempty finite set $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ of (weak) minimizers is called a* finite (weak) ϵ-solution of (P) *if*

$$\operatorname{conv} f(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) + C - \epsilon\{c\} \supseteq \mathcal{P}. \tag{7}$$

Clearly, this definition suggests polyhedral inner and outer approximations to the upper image as follows

$$\operatorname{conv} f(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) + C - \epsilon\{c\} \supseteq \mathcal{P} \supseteq \operatorname{conv} f(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) + C.$$

Note that if problem (P) is bounded with respect to K for some non-trivial closed convex cone $K \supseteq C$ and moreover if K satisfies $\mathcal{P} + K \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, then the problem, where cone K is taken as the ordering cone is equivalent to the original problem. In other words, $\operatorname{cl}(f(\mathcal{X}) + C) = \operatorname{cl}(f(\mathcal{X}) + K)$ and hence $\mathrm{wMin}_C f(\mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{wMin}_K f(\mathcal{X})$. If such K exists, then it has to be the recession cone $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$ of the upper image by Proposition 3.1. In the following definition, we suggest that we call a problem self-bounded if such cone K exists.

Definition 4.5. (P) *is said to be* self-bounded *if $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathbb{R}^q$ and if* (P) *is bounded with respect to* $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$*.* (P) *is said to be* self-unbounded *if it is not self-bounded.*

By Proposition 3.8, it is known that if a problem is self-unbounded then for any polyhedral outer approximation to the upper image, the Hausdorff distance between the outer approximation and the upper image is infinity. In particular, there exists no finite weak ϵ-solution of (P). The following is a trivial example of a self-unbounded CVOP.

Example 4.6. *Consider the biobjective optimization problem where the ordering cone is the positive orthant $\mathbb{R}^2_+$, the two objective functions to be minimized are $f_1(x) = x$, $f_2(x) = e^{-x}$ and the feasible region is the real line, $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$. Clearly, the image of the feasible region is the graph of f_2, namely $f(\mathcal{X}) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 |\ y = e^{-x}\}$ and the upper image is the epigraph of f_2, $\mathcal{P} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 |\ y \geq e^{-x}\}$. Note that the problem is not bounded since for any $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have $(x, y) + \mathbb{R}^2_+ \not\supseteq \mathcal{P}$. Moreover, one can easily check that the recession cone of $\mathcal{P}$ is $\mathbb{R}^2_+$. Hence, this problem is self-unbounded and it is not possible to find a polyhedral outer approximation to the upper image for a given error bound.*

As seen in the above example, there are convex vector optimization problems that are not *tractable* in terms of having polyhedral outer approximations and clearly self-unbounded problems are not tractable in that sense.

Assume for now that problem (P) is self-bounded. Clearly, if one can compute the recession cone $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$ of the upper image $\mathcal{P}$ and if the recession cone is polyhedral and pointed, then it is possible to apply the approximation algorithms for bounded CVOPs in the literature, where the ordering cone is taken as $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$, see [6, 15]. Note that the upper image of a self-bounded

problem is either a halfspace or its recession cone is pointed, see Remark 3.3. If the upper image of a CVOP is an halfspace, then one could possibly simplify the problem to a linear vector optimization problem and apply for instance the parametric simplex algorithm from [18], which works even if the upper image is an halfspace. On the other hand, it is in general more difficult to check if the recession cone of the upper image is polyhedral. However, this is trivially the case if the objective function is $\mathbb{R}^2$-valued for instance.

In each iteration of algorithms provided in [6, 15], a scalarization problem is solved. In particular, the *weighted sum scalarization* of (P), which is given by

$$\min \left\{ w^T f(x) |\ x \in \mathcal{X} \right\}, \tag{P_w}$$

for $w \in \mathbb{R}^q$, is solved in each iteration of the geometric dual algorithm. It is also solved at the initialization step of the 'primal' Benson's algorithm. The solutions of weighted scalarization problems are also known as proper efficient solutions in the sense of linear scalarization. The following is a well-known result stating that every proper efficient solution in the sense of linear scalarization is an efficient solution, see e.g. [13, 16].

Proposition 4.7. *Let $w \in C^+ \setminus \{0\}$. An optimal solution x^w of (P_w) is a weak minimizer of (P).*

Note that the reverse implication holds only under some assumptions. For example, it holds for linear multiobjective optimization problems (where $C = \mathbb{R}^q_+$), see [12]. For a general result in linear vector optimization problems, see [2]. Here we show a general result which holds for self-bounded convex vector optimization problems. In order to prove the result first we remind the following lemma from [8].

Lemma 4.8 ([8, Lemma 2, ii])**.** *Let C be a closed convex pointed cone in $\mathbb{R}^q$ and $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ be a non-empty closed convex set with $M \cap C = \emptyset$ and $\operatorname{recc} M \cap C = \{0\}$. Then, there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\}$ such that*

$$\gamma^T y > 0 > \gamma^T k$$

for all $y \in M$ and $k \in C \setminus \{0\}$.

Theorem 4.9. *If $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a non-empty closed set and (P) is a bounded problem, then for each weak minimizer $\bar{x}$ of (P), there exists $w \in C^+ \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\bar{x}$ is an optimal solution to (P_w).*

Proof. As $\mathcal{X}$ is closed and f is a continuous mapping between locally compact Hausdorff spaces, $f(\mathcal{X})$ is also closed. Clearly, $\operatorname{conv} f(\mathcal{X})$ is a closed and convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^q$. Moreover, as f is C-convex, $f(\mathcal{X}) + C$ is a convex set. Hence, $\operatorname{conv} f(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq f(\mathcal{X}) + C$. For $\bar{c} \in \operatorname{int} C$ and $n \geq 1$, let $M^n := \operatorname{conv} f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\bar{x}) + \frac{\bar{c}}{n}$. Then, M^n is a non-empty closed convex set and its recession cone satisfies

$$\operatorname{recc} M^n = \operatorname{recc} (\operatorname{conv} f(\mathcal{X})) \subseteq \operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P} = C,$$

as the problem is bounded. Then, $\operatorname{recc} M^n \cap (-C) = \{0\}$ since C is a pointed cone. Next, we show that $M^n \cap (-C) = \emptyset$. Assume the contrary, that is, there exists $y \in -C$ and $y \in M^n \subseteq f(\mathcal{X}) + C - f(\bar{x}) + \frac{\bar{c}}{n}$. Then, there exists $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \tilde{c} \in C$ such that $y = f(\tilde{x}) + \tilde{c} - f(\bar{x}) + \epsilon$. Note that $f(\bar{x}) - \epsilon - \tilde{c} + y = f(\tilde{x})$ is an element of $(f(\bar{x}) - \operatorname{int} C) \cap f(\mathcal{X})$, which contradicts to the fact that $\bar{x}$ is a weak minimizer. Now, applying Lemma 4.8 to M^n and $(-C)$ yields that

there exists $\gamma_n \in \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\gamma_n^T c > 0$ for all $c \in C$ and $\gamma_n^T y > 0$ for all $y \in M^n$. Hence, $\gamma_n \in \operatorname{int} C^+$ and $\gamma_n^T f(x) + \frac{\gamma_n^T \bar{c}}{n} > \gamma_n^T f(\bar{x})$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. As $\frac{\gamma_n}{\|\gamma_n\|}$ satisfies both inequalities, assume without loss of generality that $\|\gamma_n\| = 1$. Since $(\gamma_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a bounded sequence in $\operatorname{int} C^+$, it has a convergent subsequence $(\gamma_{n_m})_{m\geq 1}$ where $\lim_{m\to\infty} \gamma_{n_m} =: \gamma$ satisfies $\|\gamma\| = 1$. Then, $\gamma \in C^+ \setminus \{0\}$ and as $\gamma^T f(x) \geq \gamma^T f(\bar{x})$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\bar{x}$ is an optimal solution to the problem (P_w) for $w = \gamma$. □

Corollary 4.10. *If $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a non-empty closed set and* (P) *is a self-bounded problem, then for each weak minimizer $\bar{x}$ of* (P)*, there exists $w \in \operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P}^+ \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\bar{x}$ is an optimal solution to* (P_w)*.*

Proof. For a self-bounded problem (P), $\operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P}$ is either an halfspace or it is pointed by Remark 3.3. Moreover, if $\operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P}$ is an halfspace then $\mathcal{P}$ is an halfspace. Then, the statement trivially holds if $\operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P}$ is an halfspace. If $\operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P}$ is pointed then (P) can be reformulated as a bounded problem by taking the ordering cone as $\operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P}$. Hence, the result follows from Theorem 4.9. □

4.2 Self-Bounded Problems

In this section, we consider self-bounded problems and provide a characterization result in terms of weighted sum scalarization problems.

Recall that a vector optimization problem is said to be linear if the objective function is $f(x) = Px$ where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times n}$, the feasible region $\mathcal{X}$ and the ordering cone are polyhedral. Note that LVOPs are self-bounded as long as the upper image $\mathcal{P}$ is not the whole space. Indeed, for a LVOP with $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{P} \neq \mathbb{R}^q$, the recession cone of the upper image $\operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P}$ is polyhedral, it can be computed by solving the so called *homogeneous problem*, and problem (P) is bounded with respect to $\operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P}$, see for instance [14] for the details. Moreover, it is also known that for linear problems we have $(\operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P})^+ = \{w \in C^+ | \ (\mathrm{P}_w) \text{ is bounded}\}$, see [18].

In order to give a characterization of the self-bounded convex vector optimization problems we define

$$W := \{w \in C^+ | \ (\mathrm{P}_w) \text{ is bounded}\}. \tag{8}$$

Remark 4.11. *It is easy to show that W is a convex cone. Note also that W is not necessarily a closed cone. Consider Example 4.6. Note that $w = (r\, 0)^T \in \mathbb{R}^2_+$ makes the sum scalarization problem (P_w) unbounded for any $r > 0$. On the other hand, for any other $w \in \mathbb{R}^2_+$, (P_w) is bounded. Hence, $W = \operatorname{int} \mathbb{R}^2_+ \cup \{(0\, r)^T | \ r \geq 0\}$, and it is not a closed set.*

The following results relates the recession cone of the upper image and W for convex vector optimization problems. Indeed, by Theorem 4.13, it is seen that the above-mentioned result for LVOPs holds also for the self-bounded CVOPs.

Proposition 4.12. *It is true that* $(\operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P})^+ \supseteq \operatorname{cl} W$*.*

Proof. Let $w \in W$ and $\inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} w^T f(x) = b > -\infty$. Then, there exist a sequence $(x^n)_{n\geq 1} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $w^T f(x^n) = b + \epsilon_n$ for a decreasing sequence ϵ_n with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon_n = 0$. Let $p \in \operatorname{recc} \mathcal{P}$. It is true that $f(x^n) + p \in \mathcal{P}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then, for all $n \geq 1$, there exists $(x_k^{(n)})_{k\geq 1} \in \mathcal{X}$,

and $(c_k^{(n)})_{k\geq 1} \in C$ satisfying $f(x^n) + p = \lim_{k\to\infty}(f(x_k^{(n)}) + c_k^{(n)})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} w^T p &= \lim_{k\to\infty} (w^T f(x_k^{(n)}) + w^T c_k^{(n)}) - w^T f(x^n) \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} (w^T f(x_k^{(n)}) + w^T c_k^{(n)}) - b - \epsilon_n \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} (w^T f(x_k^{(n)}) - b) + \lim_{k\to\infty} w^T c_k^{(n)} - \epsilon_n \\ &\geq -\epsilon_n \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Then, $w^T p \geq 0$ and $w \in (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+$. As $(\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+$ is closed we also have $\operatorname{cl} W \subseteq (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+$.

□

Theorem 4.13. *If problem* (P) *is self-bounded, then* $(\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ = W$.

Proof. By Proposition 4.12, $W \subseteq (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+$. Assume (P) is self-bounded, that is, there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $\{y\} + \operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P} \supseteq \mathcal{P}$. Then, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there exists $d^x \in \operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$ such that $f(x) = y + d^x$. Let $w \in (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+$, then $w^T f(x) = w^T y + w^T d^x \geq w^T y$ as $d^x \in \operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$. Thus, we have $\inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} w^T f(x) \geq w^T y$, which shows that $w \in W$. □

It is clear By Theorem 4.13 that self-boundedness of problem (P) also guarantees that W is a closed set.

Next, we show that $W = (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+$ implies that problem (P) is self-bounded as long as $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathbb{R}^q$. For the following lemma and the theorem, consider the set

$$\Lambda := \{w \in (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ |\ w^T c = 1\}, \tag{9}$$

where $c \in \operatorname{int} C$ is fixed. Note that Λ is a compact set. Moreover, as $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P} \supseteq C$, we have $(\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ \subseteq C^+$. Then, $\Lambda = \emptyset$ holds if only if $(\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ = \{0\}$, hence $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}^q$ and $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}^q$.

Lemma 4.14. *Assume* $\{0\} \neq (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ \subseteq W$. *Then*

$$\mathcal{P}^0 := \bigcap_{w\in\Lambda} \{y \in \mathbb{R}^q |\ w^T y \leq \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} w^T f(x)\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. $\{0\} \neq (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+$ implies that $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$. As $\Lambda \subseteq (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ \subseteq W$, it is true that $y^w := \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} w^T f(x) > -\infty$ for $w \in \Lambda$. Moreover, as $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P} \supseteq C$, it is true that $\Lambda \subseteq (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ \subseteq C^+$. Hence, $w^T c > 0$ for any $w \in \Lambda$.
For contradiction, assume $\mathcal{P}_0 = \emptyset$. Then, for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^q$, there exists $w \in \Lambda$ such that $w^T y > y^w$. In particular, consider $y = -nc \in \mathbb{R}^q$ for $n \geq 1$. Then, there exists $w_n \in \Lambda$ with $-nw_n^T c > \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} w_n^T f(x) = y^{w_n}$ for $n \geq 1$. Note that $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ is compact and by Bolzano Weierstrass Theorem, it is sequentially compact. That is, there exists a convergent subsequence $(w_{n_k})_{k\geq 1}$ of (w_n) with $\lim_{k\to\infty} w_{n_k} = w \in \Lambda$. Then,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} w_{n_k}^T f(x) \leq \lim_{k\to\infty} (-n_k w_{n_k}^T c) = -\infty$$

as $w_{n_k}^T c > 0$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} n_k = \infty$.

Since f is C-convex and $w_{n_k} \in W$, $(w_{n_k}^T f)_{k\geq 1}$ are finite convex functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, $w_{n_k}^T f$ converges point-wise to $w^T f$. By Theorem 10.8 of [17], $(w_{n_k}^T f)_{k\geq 1}$ converges uniformly

to $w^T f$ on each compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathcal{X}_m := \mathcal{X} \cap B(0,m)$. Clearly, $\mathcal{X}_m$ is compact for all $m \geq 1$ and $\bigcup_{m\geq 1} \mathcal{X}_m = \mathcal{X}$. Since $w_{n_k}^T f$ uniformly converges to $w^T f$ on $\mathcal{X}_m$, we have

$$\inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}_m} w^T f(x) = \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}_m} \lim_{k\to\infty} w_{n_k}^T f(x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}_m} w_{n_k}^T f(x) =: b_m.$$

Moreover, as b_m is a decreasing sequence in $\mathbb{R}$, $\lim_{m\to\infty} b_m$ exists and

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} b_m = \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} w^T f(x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} w_{n_k}^T f(x) = -\infty,$$

which contradicts to the fact that $w \in \Lambda \subseteq W$. □

Theorem 4.15. *If* $\{0\} \neq (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ = W$*, then problem* (P) *is self-bounded.*

Proof. If $(\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ \neq \{0\}$, then $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P} \neq \mathbb{R}^q$ and $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathbb{R}^q$. Moreover, as $\{0\} \neq (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+ = W$, we have $\mathcal{P}^0 \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 4.14. Let $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{P}^0$, then we show that $\{\bar{y}\}+\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P} \supseteq \mathcal{P}$, hence, (P) is self-bounded. Assume the contrary, that is, there exists $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ with $f(\bar{x}) \notin \{\bar{y}\}+\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$. Using the separation argument, there exists $\bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\bar{w}^T f(\bar{x}) < \bar{w}^T\bar{y} + \inf_{p\in\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}} \bar{w}^T p$. Then, $\bar{w} \in (\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P})^+$ and $\inf_{p\in\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}} \bar{w}^T p \geq 0$. Let $\tilde{w} := \frac{\bar{w}}{\bar{w}^T c}$. Clearly, $\tilde{w} \in \Lambda$ and $\tilde{w}^T\bar{y} > \tilde{w}^T f(\bar{x}) \geq \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \tilde{w}^T f(x)$, which contradicts to the fact that $\bar{y} \in \mathcal{P}^0$. □

5 Concluding Remarks and Future Work

The aim of this study is to understand the structure of possibly unbounded convex vector optimization problems and to see if those are tractable in the sense that there are polyhedral inner and outer approximations of the upper image. It has been shown that not all CVOPs are tractable and indeed, only the ones that are self-bounded are tractable. For self-bounded problems we have also proved that efficient solutions coincide with the proper efficient solutions in the sense of linear scalarizations.

For the problems which are not known to be bounded, no solution concept which generates inner and outer approximations to the upper image is known in the literature. Clearly, for self-unbounded problems it is not possible to come up with such a concept as it is not possible to find a polyhedral outer approximation, see Proposition 3.8 and Definition 4.5. However, one could generalize the concept of (weak) ϵ-solution given for bounded problems to the self-bounded problems, using the recession cone of the upper image as follows.

Definition 5.1. *For a self-bounded problem* (P)*, a nonempty finite set* $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ *of (weak) minimizers is called a* finite (weak) ϵ-solution of (P) *if*

$$\operatorname{conv} f(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) + \operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P} - \epsilon\{c\} \supseteq \mathcal{P}.$$

This definition is valid in the sense that the existence is known, see Proposition 3.6 and Definition 4.5. However, since it is difficult to compute $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$ in general, it is not really practical. Note on the other hand that for two dimensional self-bounded CVOPs, $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$ is polyhedral and there are two extreme directions generating it as long as $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$ is not an halfspace. Hence, it is possible to design a search algorithm to (approximately) compute $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P}$ using the fact that the dual cone of it is exactly the weight vectors which make the weighted sum scalarization problem bounded.

As discussed in Section 1, the primal and the geometric dual Benson-type algorithms proposed in [15] are designed to solve bounded CVOPs. Note that a problem is bounded if

and only if it is self-bounded and $\operatorname{recc}\mathcal{P} = C$. Then, by Theorems 4.13 and 4.15, a problem is bounded if and only if $W = C^+$. As W is known to be a convex cone, see Remark 4.11, in order to check if a problem is bounded, it is enough to check if (P_w) is bounded for all extreme directions w of C^+.

Both primal and dual algorithms in [15] starts by solving (P_w) for extreme directions of C^+. Indeed, primal algorithm solves (P_w) only for those extreme directions to initialize the algorithm and in each iteration it solves a 'Benson-type' scalarization problem. On the other hand, at the initial step of the dual algorithm, (P_w) is solved for some $w \in \operatorname{int} C^+$. However, the algorithm continues by solving (P_w) in each iteration and it is guaranteed by the structure of (some variants of) the algorithm that (P_w) for all extreme directions of C^+ are solved in the first iteration right after the initialization. Hence, both algorithms immediately detect if a problem is bounded or not.

As stated above, the geometric dual algorithm in [15] solves weighted sum scalarization problems both to initialize the algorithm and also to iterate. Indeed, it solves the geometric dual problem of (P), which is again a vector optimization problem where the feasible region is the projection of C^+ onto a $q-1$ dimensional space, namely,

$$\Lambda_B := \{w \in C^+ |\ w^T c = 1\},$$

where $c \in \operatorname{int} C$ is fixed. In each iteration of the algorithm, a weigted sum scalarization problem (P_w) is solved for some $w \in \Lambda_B$, which is found by soving a vertex enumeration problem. Whenever the problem is bounded, all these scalar problems are also bounded.

The geometric dual algorithm has a potential to be generalized to solve self-bounded problems with the help of the theory provided here. Note that if one considers a self-bounded problem which is unbounded, then (P_w) will be unbounded for at least some $\bar{w} \in C^+$. Hence, instead of considering Λ_B, one should consider the weight set Λ given in (9). By Theorem 4.15, Λ is a closed and bounded set and it can be written as

$$\Lambda = \{w \in C^+ |\ w^T c = 1, (\mathrm{P}_w) \text{ is bounded}\}.$$

Even though this does not give a direct description of an algorithm for self-bounded problems, it may be possible to generate one by exploiting the nice structure of this set. This is left as a future work, since this paper aims to provide a theoretical background on tractability of CVOPs in general.

References

[1] H. P. Benson. An outer approximation algorithm for generating all efficient extreme points in the outcome set of a multiple objective linear programming problem. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 13:1–24, 1998.

[2] R. I. Boţ, S. M. Grad, and G. Wanka. Classical linear vector optimization duality revisited. *Optimization Letters*, 6(1):199–210, 2012.

[3] J. Y. B. Cruz. A subgradient method for vector optimization problems. *SIAM Journal of Optimization*, 23(4):2169–2182, 2013.

[4] M. Ehrgott, A. Löhne, and L. Shao. A dual variant of Benson's outer approximation algorithm. *Journal Global Optimization*, 52(4):757–778, 2012.

[5] M. Ehrgott, J. Puerto, and A. M. Rodriguez-Chia. Primal-dual simplex method for multiobjective linear programming. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 134:483–497, 2007.

[6] M. Ehrgott, L. Shao, and A. Schöbel. An approximation algorithm for convex multi-objective programming problems. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 50(3):397–416, 2011.

[7] R. E. Evans, J. P. Steuer. A revised simplex method for multiple objective programs. *Mathematical Programming*, 5(1):54–72, 1973.

[8] A. H. Hamel, F. Heyde, A. Löhne, C. Tammer, and K. Winkler. Closing the duality gap in linear vector optimization. *Journals of Convex Analysis*, 11(1):163–178, 2004.

[9] A. H. Hamel, A. Löhne, and B. Rudloff. Benson type algorithms for linear vector optimization and applications. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 59(4):811–836, 2014.

[10] F. Heyde. Geometric duality for convex vector optimization problems. *Journal of Convex Analysis*, 20(3):813–832, 2013.

[11] F. Heyde and A. Löhne. Geometric duality in multiple objective linear programming. *SIAM Journal of Optimization*, 19(2):836–845, 2008.

[12] H. Isermann. Proper efciency and the linear vector maximum problem. *Operations Research*, 22(1):189–191, 1974.

[13] J. Jahn. *Vector Optimization - Theory, Applications, and Extensions*. Springer, 2004.

[14] A. Löhne. *Vector Optimization with Infimum and Supremum*. Springer, 2011.

[15] A. Löhne, B. Rudloff, and F. Ulus. Primal and dual approximation algorithms for convex vector optimization problems. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 60(4):713–736, 2014.

[16] D. Luc. *Theory of Vector Optimization*, volume 319 of *Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems*. Springer Verlag, 1989.

[17] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1970.

[18] B. Rudloff, Ulus F., and R. J. Vanderbei. A parametric simplex algorithm for linear vector optimization problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 2016. doi: 10.1007/s10107-016-1061-z.